


Early and late dot-probe attentional bias to mild and high threat pictures: Relations with EEG theta/beta ratio, self-reported trait attentional control, and trait anxiety

Dana van Son^{1,2}  | Angelos Angelidis^{1,2} | Muriel A. Hagenaars³ | Willem van der Does^{1,2} | Peter Putman^{1,2}

¹Institute of Psychology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

²Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition, Leiden, The Netherlands

³Department of Clinical Psychology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Correspondence

Dana van Son, Department of Clinical Psychology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Email: danavson@gmail.com

Funding information

Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, Grant/Award Number: 452-12-003

Abstract

Frontal EEG theta/beta ratio (TBR; negatively associated with attentional control, or AC) was previously reported to moderate threat-level dependent attentional bias in a pictorial dot-probe task, interacting with trait anxiety. Unexpectedly, this was independent from processing stage (using cue-target delays of 200 and 500 ms) and also not observed for self-reported trait AC. We therefore aimed to replicate these effects of TBR and trait anxiety and to test if effects of early versus late processing stages are evident for shorter cue-target delays. This study also revisited the hypothesis that TBR and self-reported trait AC show similar effects. Fifty-three participants provided measurements of frontal TBR, self-reported trait AC, trait anxiety, and dot-probe task bias for mild and high threat pictures using the same dot-probe task, but this time with 80- and 200-ms cue-target delays. Results indicated that higher TBR predicted more attention to mild than high threat, but this was independent from trait anxiety or delay. Lower self-reported trait AC predicted more attention to mild than high threat, only after 200 ms (also independent of trait anxiety). We conclude that the moderating effect of TBR on threat-level dependent dot-probe task bias was replicated, but not the role of trait anxiety, and this study partially confirms that effects of trait AC are more dominant in later processing.

KEYWORDS

attentional bias, attentional control, avoidance, EEG theta/beta ratio, trait anxiety

1 | INTRODUCTION

Vigilance to highly threatening stimuli is a natural and adaptive response (Ohman, 1993, 1994; Whalen, 1998). An efficient response when task-irrelevant stimuli are subjectively evaluated as being only mildly aversive would be to direct attention away from them (e.g., Bradley, Mogg, Falla, & Hamilton, 1998; Koster, Verschuere, Crombez, & Van Damme, 2005; MacLeod, Mathews, & Tata, 1986). Highly anxious individuals have a tendency to appraise mildly threatening stimuli and situations as highly threatening (see Cisler & Koster,

2010; Mogg & Bradley, 1998, 2016). Many studies have indeed demonstrated a vigilant bias to high threat in most people, which extends toward mild threat when people are more anxious (for reviews and meta-analysis, see Bar-Haim, Lamy, Pergamin, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJzendoorn, 2007; Cisler & Koster, 2010; Van Bockstaele et al., 2014). This attentional overprocessing of mild threat, or “attentional bias to threat,” may occur automatically and is probably a maintenance factor of anxiety disorders (Van Bockstaele et al.). In highly anxious individuals, however, attentional avoidance might also occur (e.g., Koster et al., 2005; Mogg, Bradley,

Miles, & Dixon, 2004; Schoorl, Putman, Van Der Werff, & Van Der Does, 2014; Wald et al., 2011). This attentional avoidance may occur especially for highly threatening stimuli (Mogg & Bradley, 2016), for example, phobia- or trauma-related stimuli or scenes cueing immediate threats to physical integrity (e.g., Koster, Crombez, Verschuere, Vanvolsem, & De Houwer, 2007; Mogg, Philippot, & Bradley, 2004; Pine et al., 2005; Schoorl et al., 2014). Trait attentional control (AC) may have a crucial influence in this (Mogg & Bradley, 1998, 2016). Attentional avoidance may result from a secondary process, mediated by strategic, top-down AC (Mogg & Bradley, 2016). The question of whether such avoidance is indeed controlled or if it also occurs automatically is still open to empirical study. For instance, more avoidance of trauma-related pictures was observed in patients with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) who also reported low AC, suggesting that avoidance was the more automatic response (Schoorl et al., 2014). Also, the time course of such a supposedly secondary avoidant response is far from clear, and it may occur even earlier than 200 ms after cue presentation (Koster et al., 2007; Mackintosh & Mathews, 2003).

Consequently, individual differences in trait AC may be of crucial importance in the manifestation of attentional bias to threat. Trait AC may be measured by self-report (attentional control scale, ACS; Derryberry & Reed, 2002). Most studies on trait AC and attentional bias used the ACS (e.g., Bardeen & Orcutt, 2011; Derryberry & Reed, 2002; Peers & Lawrence, 2009; Putman, Arias-Garcia, Pantazi, & van Schie, 2012; Schoorl et al., 2014; Taylor, Cross, & Amir, 2016), and three studies used an objective (performance-based) measure of AC (Bardeen & Daniel, 2017; Hou et al., 2014; Reinholdt-Dunne, Mogg, & Bradley, 2009). Research into the role of trait AC in attentional threat bias may benefit from using self-report as well as objective markers of trait AC to obtain converging evidence for different methods (see also Bardeen & Daniel, 2017).

A potential objective electrophysiological measure for trait AC can be derived from spontaneous (also known as resting-state) activity in EEG. Frontal theta/beta ratio (TBR) reflects the ratio between power in the slow (theta) frequency band and the fast (beta) frequency band. High TBR is related to poor prefrontal cortex (PFC) mediated attentional and inhibitory functions, as seen in attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD; for reviews and meta-analyses, see Arns, Conners, & Kraemer, 2013; Barry, Clarke, & Johnstone, 2003). TBR has been suggested to reflect functional reciprocal cortical-subcortical interactions in healthy as well as clinical populations (Knyazev, 2007; Schutter & Knyazev, 2012), and it might reflect voluntary top-down processes of executive control (including AC), mediated by (dorsolateral) PFC, over bottom-up processes from limbic areas (such as the anterior cingulate cortex, hippocampus, and amygdala; Bishop, 2008; Gregoriou, Rossi, Ungerleider, & Desimone,

2014; Hermans, Henckens, Joels, & Fernandez, 2014; Knyazev, 2007; Schutter & Knyazev, 2012). Besides TBR's association with ADHD, its status as an index of AC is based on repeated observations that frontal TBR is associated with PFC-mediated cognitive and cognitive-emotional processes (Angelidis, Hagenars, van Son, van der Does, & Putman, 2018; Angelidis, van der Does, Schakel, & Putman, 2016; Keune et al., 2017; Massar, Kenemans, & Schutter, 2014; Putman, van Peer, Maimari, & van der Werff, 2010; Putman, Verkuil, Arias-Garcia, Pantazi, & van Schie, 2014; Sari, Koster, Pourtois, & Derakshan, 2016; Schutte, Kenemans, & Schutter, 2017; Schutter & Van Honk, 2005). PFC-mediated cognitive control seems to play an important role in the attentional processing of threatening information (see also Mogg & Bradley, 2016; Shechner & Bar-Haim, 2016).

Accordingly, TBR was positively correlated with attention toward mild threat and negatively correlated with attention toward high threat, as measured with a dot-probe task (Angelidis et al., 2018). The latter correlation was mostly evident for low anxious people. Those data confirmed that adaptive attentional responding to varying threat levels depends on cognitive control and that TBR can be used to study these processes. The first aim of the present study was to replicate these novel findings for TBR and trait anxiety in relation to threat-level dependent attentional bias, using the same dot-probe task as Angelidis et al. Because of the theoretical assumption that processes of trait AC in attentional threat bias need some time to develop as they might rely on secondary PFC-mediated control over fast and automatic initial bottom-up processes (Bardeen & Orcutt, 2011; Derryberry & Reed, 2002; Koster et al., 2007; Mogg & Bradley, 1998, 2016; Ohman, 1993, 1994; Whalen, 1998), Angelidis et al. (2018) tested if effects of TBR would be different in early and late processing stages. However, contrary to expectations, the results of Angelidis et al. were independent of processing stage: a 200-ms cue-target delay (intended to capture the early attentional processes) showed no different results than a 500-ms cue-target delay (late attentional processes). We concluded that 200-ms delay may have been too long to capture early attentional processes and that the delay hypothesis should be revisited. The second aim of the present study was therefore to revisit the hypothesis that AC should influence attentional bias more in later and controlled than in earlier and automatic processing stages, using shorter cue-target delays than in Angelidis et al.: a short delay of 80 ms and a long delay of 200 ms.

Another unexpected finding in Angelidis et al. (2018) was that self-reported trait AC was not related to threat bias or to TBR. To show the role of trait AC in attentional processing of threat using converging methods (EEG and self-report) would strengthen the interpretation of these findings. Therefore, the third aim of the current study was to re-examine the relationship between attentional bias and

trait AC, using ACS scores as well as TBR as indices of trait AC. We hypothesized that TBR and ACS would be negatively correlated—when controlling for trait anxiety (cf. Angelidis et al., 2016; Putman et al., 2010; Putman et al., 2014) and that both indices would show similar relations with anxious attentional bias to threat.

In summary, building on the findings of Angelidis et al. (2018) and theoretical frameworks on the effects of threat-level and processing stages in relation to anxiety as outlined above (e.g., Mogg & Bradley, 1998, 2016), we aimed to investigate whether frontal EEG TBR is related to attentional bias in response to mild and high threatening stimuli (also in interaction with trait anxiety), if these effects are more pronounced in later (controlled) than earlier (automatic) processing stages, and if self-reported trait AC and TBR (which are expected to correlate negatively) show converging effects. We used the same design as in Angelidis et al. (2018), but the dot-probe task contained a similar but new set of stimuli and shorter cue-target delays (80 and 200 ms). We tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1a: Frontal TBR moderates attentional responding to threat-level dependent bias in a dot-probe task, and high frontal TBR will be related to relatively more attention toward mild threatening pictures and relatively more attention away from high threatening pictures.

Hypothesis 1b: Self-reported trait anxiety moderates the relationship of Hypothesis 1a between frontal TBR and effect of threat level.

Hypothesis 2: These effects of Hypothesis 1a and 1b should be more pronounced after a long cue-target delay (200 ms) than after a short cue-target delay (80 ms).

Hypothesis 3: Self-reported trait AC correlates negatively to TBR when controlling for trait anxiety.

Hypothesis 4a: Self-reported trait AC moderates attentional responding to threat-level dependent bias in a dot-probe task, and low trait AC will be related to relatively more attention toward mild threatening pictures and relatively more attention away from high threatening pictures.

Hypothesis 4b: Self-reported trait anxiety moderates the relationship of Hypothesis 4a between self-reported trait AC and effect of threat level.

Hypothesis 5: These effects of Hypothesis 4a and 4b should be more pronounced after a long cue-target delay (200 ms) than after a short cue-target delay (80 ms).

These hypotheses were tested in a sample of healthy students, unselected for anxiety levels, looking at the average TBR

of the frontal electrodes F3, Fz, and F4 as in almost all relevant previous studies in healthy participants.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Participants

Fifty-three students (47 women) took part in this study. All participants signed informed consent. Participants were between 18 and 30 years old. Exclusion criteria were presence of a mood, anxiety, or attention disorder; frequent use of psychoactive substances; and (history of) a neurological disorder. The study was approved by the local ethics review board (CEP#5927902162).

2.2 | Materials

2.2.1 | Questionnaires

Participants completed the trait version of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-t; Spielberger, 1983; Van der Ploeg, Defares, & Spielberger, 1980) and the ACS (Derryberry & Reed, 2002; Verwoerd, de Jong, & Wessel, 2006). The STAI-t assesses trait anxiety (20 items, range 20–80; Cronbach's alpha in the current study = 0.89) and the ACS assesses self-reported attentional control in terms of attentional focus, attentional switching, and the capacity to quickly generate new thoughts (20 items, range 20–80; Cronbach's alpha in the current study = 0.85).

2.2.2 | Dot-probe task pictures and IAPS ratings

For the dot-probe task, 60 pictures were used from the International Affective Picture System (IAPS; Lang, Bradley, & Cuthbert, 1997), a standardized set of emotion-eliciting color pictures with normative ratings on valence and arousal. The pictures (stimuli) were selected according to the ratings for valence and arousal (scale 1–9; valence: 1 = *very unpleasant* to 9 = *very pleasant*; and arousal scales: 1 = *not arousing at all* to 9 = *very arousing*) provided by Lang et al. (1997).¹ The mean valence score for mild threatening (MT) stimuli was $M = 2.52$ ($SD = 0.66$) and for high threatening (HT) stimuli $M = 1.63$ ($SD = 0.33$); the mean arousal scores were $M = 5.98$ ($SD = 0.91$) and $M = 6.79$ ($SD = 0.55$), respectively. Of the 48 stimuli that

¹The following pairs of picture numbers were used—HT-N: 3,010–1616, 5,661–3,130, 3,000–7,195, 3,053–7,200, 7,496–3,064, 7,291–3,080, 3,051–7,482, 7,110–3,068; MT-N: 7,330–1,300, 6,570–5,890, 3,350–5,532, 5,480–8,485, 9,265–1590, 5,622–9,584, 5,470–3,530, 5,830–9,921; N-N: 2,514–1540, 5,471–5,593, 1731–7,490, 2,388–2,594, 5,833–2,398, 5,010–5,201, 5,731–2,515, 5,250–7,031.

were used in the main task, 32 were neutral (N; e.g., shoes), 8 were high threatening (e.g., mutilated body), and 8 were mild threatening (e.g., angry dog) in content. Three types of stimulus pairs were created: N-N, MT-N, and HT-N. N-N trials were included to avoid habituation to threatening stimuli; the results of these trials are not reported here. A total of 8 N-N, 8 HT-N, and 8 MT-N stimuli pairs were created. The remaining 12 neutral stimuli were selected for 12 N-N practice trials. Each pair of stimuli was subjectively matched on color and composition. We tested whether the average valence and arousal ratings reported by Lang et al. (1997) differed between the categories. HT stimuli had lower valence ratings than MT, $t(31) = 3.42$, $p = 0.004$, and neutral stimuli, $t(31) = 13.20$, $p < 0.001$. MT stimuli also had more unpleasant ratings than neutral stimuli, $t(31) = 10.40$, $p < 0.001$. No difference was found between arousal ratings of HT stimuli and MT stimuli, $t(31) = -2.16$, $p = 0.53$; HT and MT pictures were both more arousing than neutral pictures (HT-N: $t(31) = -7.15$, $p < 0.001$; MT-N: $t(31) = -4.68$, $p < 0.001$).

2.2.3 | EEG recording and software

EEG recording was done using 32 Ag/AgCl electrodes placed in an extended 10–20 montage using the ActiveTwo BioSemi system (BioSemi, The Netherlands). Electrodes placed on the left and right mastoids were used for offline referencing of the scalp signals to the mastoid signals. The dot-probe task and questionnaires were programmed and presented using E-Prime V2.0 (Psychology Software Tools, Pittsburgh, PA).

2.3 | Procedure

2.3.1 | General procedure

After informed consent had been obtained, participants completed the STAI-t and the ACS. This was followed by the measurement of resting state EEG in eight alternating 1-min blocks of eyes open/closed recording. The dot-probe task was performed afterward. The study took approximately 1 hr to complete.

2.3.2 | Attentional bias

The dot-probe task was as in Angelidis et al. (2018); however, we used a largely different stimulus set and different intervals for short and long probe delays. During the task, participants sat at a distance of 80 cm from the screen. The task consisted of 12 practice and 192 test trials, consisting of 64 HT-N, 64 MT-N, and 64 N-N trials. In test trials, all stimulus pairs were presented eight times in random order, fully counterbalanced for cue-target delay (80 or 200 ms), probe position (left/right), and congruency. Each trial started with a random intertrial interval (ITI) between 500 and 1,500 ms. The ITI was followed by a black fixation cross that was presented for 1,000 ms in the center of a gray screen, and participants were instructed to look at this cross. The fixation cross was followed by two pictures that appeared vertically centered, 2.2 cm left and right from the screen. Pictures were presented with a height of 7.6 cm and width of 10.7 cm. Immediately after offset of the pictures, a probe (black dot; 5 mm diameter) appeared below the left or right picture location. The participants were asked to indicate the probe location as fast and accurately as possible by pressing response boxes attached to the left and right arm of their chair with their index fingers.

2.4 | Data processing

2.4.1 | Dot-probe data

Incorrect responses were excluded from analyses. One participant made 27 errors (more than five standard deviations above mean) and was excluded from further dot-probe task analyses. The average number of errors of the remaining participants was 3.57 ($SD = 2.5$) with a range from 0 to 11. Probe detection was measured in milliseconds, and reaction times (RTs) that were shorter than 300 ms or longer than 1,000 ms were defined as outliers and removed from the data. After applying this first filter, RTs that deviated more than three standard deviations from the individual mean RT were also removed as outlier (mean total number of removed outliers

TABLE 1 Mean RTs and bias scores (standard deviations) in milliseconds for the two probe delays and threat levels in the dot-probe task

Probe-target delay	Threat level	Congruent	Incongruent	Bias score
80 ms	MT-N	339 (36)	341 (41)	2 (20)
	HT-N	340 (35)	337 (38)	-3 (16)
200 ms	MT-N	330 (39)	326 (39)	-4 (16)
	HT-N	330 (38)	333 (38)	3 (21)
Total	MT-N	334 (41)	333 (39)	-1 (10)
	HT-N	335 (35)	335 (37)	-0.4 (14)

Note. RT = reaction time; MT = mild threatening; HT = high threatening; N = neutral. ($N = 53$)

per participant was 4.27, $SD = 2.61$). The number of outliers per participant ranged from 0 to 14. An average of 2.1% of the data were removed in total; mean RT of remaining data was 335 ms ($SD = 36$). Bias scores were calculated for HT-N and MT-N trials separately in short cue-target delay trials (80 ms) and long cue-target delay trials (200 ms) by subtracting the average response time on congruent trials from incongruent trials. Positive bias scores indicate selective attention toward threat whereas negative scores indicate attentional avoidance. Mean RTs and SD s per stimulus pair per condition and bias scores are presented in Table 1. Finally, Δ threat-level contrast scores were calculated separately for short and long delay conditions by subtracting average bias scores of HT-N trials from average bias scores of MT-N trials (a higher score reflecting a relatively stronger attentional bias toward mild compared to high threatening stimuli).

2.4.2 | EEG processing

Offline data processing was done using BrainVision Analyzer V2.0.4 (Brain Products GmbH, Germany). Data were high-pass filtered at 0.1 Hz, low-pass filtered at 100-Hz, and a 50-Hz notch filter was applied. The data were automatically corrected for ocular artifacts (Gratton, Coles, & Donchin, 1983) in segments of 4 s. Remaining segments containing muscle movements, amplitudes above 200 μ V, or other artifacts were removed. Fast Fourier transform (Hamming window length 10%) was applied to calculate power density for the beta (13–30 Hz) and theta (4–7 Hz) band. The present research questions concerned the average of the frontal electrodes (F3, Fz, and F4, as in Angelidis et al., 2018; see also Angelidis et al., 2016; Putman et al., 2010; Putman et al., 2014; Schutter & Van Honk, 2005). These frontal averages were therefore calculated for both the beta and theta band; other electrodes were used for exploratory purposes that were not meant to be reported. One participant had extremely high theta activity (more than four standard deviations above the mean) and was excluded from further EEG analyses. Frontal TBR was calculated by dividing the frontal theta by frontal beta power density. Frontal TBR was non-normally distributed, and therefore, log₁₀-normalized.

2.4.3 | Statistical analyses

The mean bias scores were analyzed using a 2 Cue-Target Delay \times 2 Threat Level repeated measures analysis of variance (rm ANOVA). To test if TBR moderated the effect of threat level on bias score (Hypothesis 1a), a two-level (threat level) rm ANOVA was performed, this time with frontal TBR added as a covariate to the model. This concerns a directional planned replication hypothesis, so a one-sided test was performed. Mahalanobis distance tests were used to

check for bivariate outliers. To test Hypotheses 1b and 2, the two-level (threat level) rm ANOVA was repeated, followed by a 2 Cue-Target Delay \times 2 Threat Level rm ANOVA with centered frontal TBR, centered STAI-t, and their interaction term added as covariates to both models. Centered variables were used as predictor variables in the model to control for multicollinearity. Partial correlation testing was done to test Hypothesis 3 for the association between TBR and ACS, and to control for confounding by STAI-t (see Angelidis et al., 2016; Putman et al., 2010; Putman et al., 2014). The same analyses that were done for Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 2 were repeated for Hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 5, but centered frontal TBR was replaced by centered ACS.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Participants

Participants ($N = 53$) had a mean age of 21.7 years ($SD = 2.6$), mean STAI-t score of 37.7 ($SD = 9.9$), and mean ACS score of 51 ($SD = 8.4$). The mean frontal TBR that was measured during resting state was 1.26 ($SD = 0.54$).

3.2 | Dot probe

Mean RTs and bias scores are presented in Table 1. No significant main effect or interaction effects were observed: cue-target delay, $F(1, 51) = 0.067$, $p = 0.798$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.001$; threat level, $F(1, 51) = 0.504$, $p = 0.481$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$, Cue-Target Delay \times Threat Level, $F(1, 51) = 3.283$, $p = 0.076$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.06$. Overall bias score compared to zero was also not significant, $t(51) = -0.169$, $p = 0.866$. In sum, without taking into account variables of individual differences, no clear pattern of biases occurred for the dot-probe task (see Table 1).

3.3 | Frontal TBR moderates attentional responding to threat-level dependent bias in a dot-probe task (Hypothesis 1a)

Mahalanobis distance tests revealed a significant bivariate outlier case for the relationship between frontal TBR and threat-bias ($D^2 = 7.46$; $p < 0.05$ for MT bias and $D^2 = 14.06$; $p < 0.001$ for HT bias). This case was removed for analyses on TBR and dot-probe task data. The main effect of threat level was nonsignificant, $F(1, 48) = 0.142$, $p = 0.708$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.003$, but interaction effect of Frontal TBR \times Threat Level was significant (one-tailed), $F(1, 48) = 3.038$, $p = 0.044$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.06$. The effect remained significant (one-tailed) when controlling for STAI-t, $F(1, 47) = 3.831$, $p = 0.028$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.075$. Figure 1 depicts this interaction as the relation between TBR and Δ threat level. It can be seen that high frontal TBR is associated with relatively more attention toward mild threat than toward high threat. Follow-up tests showed no significant correlation




FIGURE 1 Relation between Ln-normalized frontal EEG TBR and Δ threat level (bias for MT stimuli – bias for HT stimuli)

between frontal TBR and bias for MT ($r = -0.19$, $p = 0.19$) but a significant negative correlation between frontal TBR and bias for HT ($r = -0.41$, $p = 0.003$). Hypothesis 1a was therefore confirmed.

3.4 | Self-reported trait anxiety moderates the relationship between frontal TBR and effect of threat level (Hypothesis 1b)

The crucial interaction effect between frontal TBR, STAI-t, and threat level was not significant, $F(1, 46) = 0.046$, $p = 0.831$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.001$. Hypothesis 1b was therefore rejected.

3.5 | Cue-target delay related to TBR and TBR \times Trait Anxiety in threat-level dependent dot-probe performance (Hypothesis 2)

The crucial interaction effect between Frontal TBR \times Cue-Target Delay \times Threat Level was not significant, $F(1, 48) = 0.016$, $p = 0.898$, $\eta_p^2 < 0.001$. When we added STAI-t and the frontal TBR \times STAI-t interaction term, there was no significant crucial STAI-t \times TBR \times Cue-Target Delay \times Threat Level interaction, $F(1, 46) = 1.005$, $p = 0.321$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.021$. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

3.6 | The relation between TBR and trait AC (Hypothesis 3)

TBR was significantly negatively correlated to trait AC (as measured by the ACS; when controlling for STAI-t, the

partial correlation was $r = -0.32$; $p = 0.024$). Frontal TBR also correlated significantly negatively to STAI-t when controlling for ACS (partial $r = -0.336$; $p = 0.016$). Hypothesis 3 was thus confirmed.

3.7 | The effect of trait AC and Trait AC \times Trait Anxiety in threat-level dependent dot-probe performance (Hypotheses 4a and 4b)

We performed the same moderation analyses for trait AC (as measured by the ACS) as we did for TBR using the two-level (threat level) rm ANOVA with ACS as covariate. This showed no significant ACS \times Threat Level interaction, $F(1, 50) = 0.149$, $p = 0.701$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.003$. To test if the interaction of ACS \times STAI-t moderated effect of threat level, the model was repeated using ACS, STAI-t, and their interaction in the model. This revealed no significant ACS \times STAI-t \times Threat Level interaction, $F(1, 48) = 0.167$, $p = 0.685$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.003$. Hypotheses 4a and 4b are therefore rejected.

3.8 | Cue-target delay related to Trait AC \times Trait Anxiety in threat-level dependent dot-probe performance (Hypothesis 5)

A significant ACS \times Cue-Target Delay \times Threat Level interaction was found, $F(1, 50) = 7.339$, $p = 0.009$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.128$. This interaction remained significant when we controlled for STAI-t, $F(1, 49) = 7.863$, $p = 0.007$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.138$. This confirms Hypothesis 5. Follow-up analyses showed a trend-level ACS \times Threat Level interaction in the short delay condition,




FIGURE 2 Relationship between Δ threat level (bias score MT – bias score HT) in ms and attentional control in short (80 ms, left) and long (200 ms, right) cue-target delays

$F(1, 50) = 3.174, p = 0.08, \eta_p^2 = 0.06$. Figure 2, left panel, depicting this interaction as the correlation between ACS and Δ threat level, clarifies the nature of this interaction; higher ACS scores were associated with a tendency toward higher difference scores for bias for mild minus high threat. ACS was negatively associated with bias toward HT ($r = -0.29, p = 0.04$) and not with bias for MT ($r = 0.09, p = 0.53$) in the short delay condition.

In the long delay condition, there was a significant ACS \times Threat Level interaction, $F(1, 50) = 5.046, p = 0.03, \eta_p^2 = 0.092$, which remained significant when controlling for STAI-t, $F(1, 50) = 5.696, p = 0.02, \eta_p^2 = 0.104$. Figure 2 clarifies the nature of this interaction; lower ACS scores were associated with a tendency toward higher difference scores for bias for mild minus high threat. ACS was significantly negatively correlated to bias to MT ($r = -0.28, p = 0.04$) and nonsignificantly positively correlated with bias to HT ($r = 0.20, p = 0.15$).

To test if ACS and STAI-t interactively moderated a Cue-Target Delay \times Threat Level effect on bias scores, the 2 Cue-Target Delay \times 2 Threat Level ANOVA was run with ACS, STAI-t, and their interaction term in the model. This showed no significant STAI-t \times ACS \times Cue-Target Delay \times Threat Level interaction, $F(1, 48) = 0.001, p = 0.973, \eta_p^2 < 0.001$. Hypothesis 5 is thus partially confirmed.

4 | DISCUSSION

This study investigated whether frontal EEG TBR is related to threat-level dependent attentional bias, alone and in interaction with trait anxiety, if results were more pronounced after a longer cue-target delay than after a shorter delay, and if findings for self-reported trait AC and for TBR converged to further test the construct validity of TBR as a marker of

trait AC and its role in attentional bias. Results showed that lower TBR was associated with more attention toward high than toward mild threat. Trait anxiety did not interact with TBR's relation to threat-level dependent bias, contrary to expectation. The TBR threat level interaction was not affected by cue-target delay. As expected, TBR and ACS were negatively correlated, and ACS moderated attentional bias to different threat levels in a similar manner as TBR did. ACS did not interact with trait anxiety either, but the association between ACS and threat level was dependent on cue-target delay, as predicted: the ACS \times Threat Level interaction was specific to the longer cue-target delay. These results are further discussed below.

The finding that TBR moderates attentional bias to different threat levels replicates our previous study (Angelidis et al., 2018). We tested this hypothesis one-sided since it concerns a planned replication hypothesis, but it should be noted that this was a statistical trend ($p = 0.056$) when tested two-sided, likely due to our somewhat smaller sample size. Angelidis et al. (2018) reported that higher TBR (low cognitive control) was associated with relative avoidance of high threatening stimuli compared to mild threatening stimuli, and the current data show the same interaction for TBR and threat level. This is in line with the cognitive motivational model of attentional bias (Mogg & Bradley, 1998, 2016), indicating that attentional bias toward threat may be opposed by mechanisms of avoidance and that individual differences in cognitive control are crucial in the actual manifestation of threat bias toward or away from threat (Mogg & Bradley, 2016; Mogg, Weinman, & Mathews, 1987).

Our next hypothesis was that the moderation of TBR on threat level would be different in early (80-ms cue-target delays) compared to later (200-ms cue-target delays) stages of attention. However, our data did not show this, similar to Angelidis et al. (2018) where cue-target delays of 200 and

500 ms were used. The expectation that cue-target delay would affect the results originates from the assumption that the cognitive control mechanisms that regulate automatic attention away from threat (attentional avoidance) occur at later stages of attentional processing (Cisler & Koster, 2010; Derryberry & Reed, 2002; Mogg & Bradley, 1998, 2016). The current results for TBR and the results of Angelidis et al. (2018) do not support this notion. One methodological explanation of the current findings might be that the short cue-target delay was too short for sufficient emotional-attentional processing so no bias might be measured at all. However, ACS scores were significantly associated with bias (toward high threat) in the short delay condition. This suggests that the short cue-target delay condition was sufficient to allow measurement of attentional bias. An 80-ms delay is known to allow orienting of visuospatial attention (Posner & Cohen, 1984), and in dot-probe tasks, anxious selective attention toward threat has already been observed after 50 ms (Armony & Dolan, 2002) and even after 34 ms, using subliminal presentation (Fox, 2002). All in all, we do not think that the cue-target delay of 80 ms was too short. Another possible methodological explanation for the current data might be that the difference between 80 ms and 200 ms is not large enough to distinguish between early and late attentional processes. Importantly, though, we did find a significant delay-dependent ACS moderation of threat level, where the association was stronger in the longer cue-target condition, as expected. In conclusion, we do not have a ready explanation for the absence of a delay effect for TBR, especially considering the current positive finding for ACS. The latter finding is in line with two previous studies (Bardeen & Orcutt, 2011; Derryberry & Reed, 2002) that also measured visuospatial threat-biased attention, albeit with different cue-target delays. Considering a delay effect for one measure of trait AC (ACS) but no such effect for the other index of trait AC (TBR), we conclude that our results on this issue are inconclusive. Measuring the time course of attention remains notoriously difficult (see also Mogg & Bradley, 2016). Different methods such as emotional cueing tasks (Koster et al., 2007), ERP tasks (Harrewijn, Schmidt, Westenberg, Tang, & van der Molen, 2017), or even nonspatial emotional-attention tasks such as interference tasks (Clarke, MacLeod, & Guastella, 2013) or serial presentation tasks (Peers & Lawrence, 2009) might be used in future studies to assess the time course of selective attention, attentional avoidance, and attentional control.

We hypothesized that the moderation of TBR on threat level would interact with trait anxiety, but this was not observed. A possible explanation might be that we used different stimuli than in Angelidis et al. (2018). We cannot compare the sets because the ratings of the stimuli in Angelidis et al. (2018) were collected in a different sample and in a different experimental setting than the IAPS ratings. Perhaps

preselecting participants on high trait anxiety and/or manipulation of state anxiety could be helpful in resolving this issue, as attentional threat bias might depend on interaction between trait and state anxiety (Egloff & Hock, 2001).

Contrary to Angelidis et al. (2018), a significant correlation between TBR and ACS scores (independent of trait anxiety) was found in the current sample, which is in line with previous studies from our lab (Angelidis et al., 2016; Putman et al., 2010, 2014) and with reported negative correlations between TBR and task-based objective measures of attention (Keune et al., 2017). Conceptualizing TBR as a marker of attentional control, we also predicted that ACS scores (which indicate trait AC) would show a similar relation with dot-probe task performance as TBR. This was partially confirmed: lower ACS was related to relative avoidance of high threatening stimuli and also to attentional bias toward mild threatening stimuli. This conceptually replicates the TBR effect, but only when taking cue-target delay into consideration, which is largely consistent with our predictions. Although TBR was reported to have a very high 1- and 2-week retest reliability (Angelidis et al., 2016; Keune et al., 2017), little is known about transient state fluctuations of TBR, and operationally our TBR measure was done at a single point in time. Since acute fluctuations in trait AC may occur as a function of factors as diverse as fatigue (Van der Linden, Frese, & Meijman, 2003) or circadian rhythm (Van Dongen & Dinges, 2000), results for trait and state measures of trait AC should not be expected to correlate perfectly. As such, it is encouraging that results of the current study for trait ACS and TBR converged. This solidifies the interpretation of the current TBR results as well as the similar results of Angelidis et al. (2018), supporting the construct validity of TBR as a reflection of neural processes underlying trait AC.

Altogether, our findings that both TBR and ACS are related to attentional processing of cues with different threat levels indicate that executive control plays a critical role in threat processing. The current study emphasizes the importance of threat level; different attentional responses were found for high versus mild threatening stimuli, moderated by frontal TBR and ACS. Schechner and Bar-Haim (2016) recently also emphasized the importance of subjective threat evaluation (influences of state anxiety) in the manifestation of threat-avoidant attentional bias. Their findings and ours carry possible implications for the currently popular attentional bias modification paradigm and its attempts to train attentional bias away from threat with the objective of effecting more adaptive and healthy attentional processing styles (Cristea, Kok, & Cuijpers, 2015).

Potential limitations of this study include that we used a smaller sample and a lower number of males than the previous study (Angelidis et al., 2018). The stimulus set included eight high and eight mild threatening stimuli, which may

be considered a fairly small set. The fact that our results for TBR and threat-level dependent attention partially replicate Angelidis et al. (2018), who used a largely different stimulus set, is reassuring. Still, future research could consider using larger sets of stimuli to avoid possible artifacts resulting from narrow stimulus sampling.

To conclude, this study partially replicated previously reported relations between TBR and threat-level dependent dot-probe bias, and as such supports the notion of frontal TBR as an electrophysiological marker for executive control (i.e., regulation of attentional processing of threatening stimuli). The direction of attentional bias depends on individual differences in attentional control and threat level of the stimuli. The issue of early and automatic versus late and controlled attentional processing remains unresolved as only effects of self-reported trait AC, but not of TBR, were confined to a later stage of processing, and this requires further investigation. Finally, converging results were found for TBR and an often used and validated (Judah, Grant, Mills, & Lechner, 2014) self-report measure of trait AC, supporting construct validity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by a grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (N.W.O.-VIDI; #452-12-003 to P. P.). NWO was not involved in the study. All authors were involved in the study design and final manuscript.

ORCID

Dana van Son  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0729-1237>

REFERENCES

- Angelidis, A., Hagens, M., van Son, D., van der Does, W., & Putman, P. (2018). Do not look away! Spontaneous frontal EEG theta/beta ratio as a marker for cognitive control over attention to mild and high threat. *Biological Psychology*, *135*, 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2018.03.002>
- Angelidis, A., van der Does, W., Schakel, L., & Putman, P. (2016). Frontal EEG theta/beta ratio as an electrophysiological marker for attentional control and its test-retest reliability. *Biological Psychology*, *121*(Pt A), 49–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2016.09.008>
- Armony, J. L., & Dolan, R. J. (2002). Modulation of spatial attention by fear-conditioned stimuli: An event-related fMRI study. *Neuropsychologia*, *40*(7), 817–826. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(01\)00178-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(01)00178-6)
- Arns, M., Conners, C. K., & Kraemer, H. C. (2013). A decade of EEG theta/beta ratio research in ADHD: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Attentional Disorders*, *17*(5), 374–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054712460087>
- Bardeen, J. R., & Daniel, T. A. (2017). A longitudinal examination of the role of attentional control in the relationship between posttraumatic stress and threat-related attentional bias: An eye-tracking study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *99*, 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2017.09.003>
- Bardeen, J. R., & Orcutt, H. K. (2011). Attentional control as a moderator of the relationship between posttraumatic stress symptoms and attentional threat bias. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *25*(8), 1008–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2011.06.009>
- Bar-Haim, Y., Lamy, D., Pergamin, L., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2007). Threat-related attentional bias in anxious and nonanxious individuals: A meta-analytic study. *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.1>
- Barry, R. J., Clarke, A. R., & Johnstone, S. J. (2003). A review of electrophysiology in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: I. *Qualitative and Quantitative Electroencephalography. Clinical Neurophysiology*, *114*(2), 171–183. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457\(02\)00362-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457(02)00362-0)
- Bishop, S. J. (2008). Neural mechanisms underlying selective attention to threat. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1129*, 141–152. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1417.016>
- Bradley, B. P., Mogg, K., Falla, S. J., & Hamilton, L. R. (1998). Attentional bias for threatening facial expressions in anxiety: Manipulation of stimulus duration. *Cognition and Emotion*, *12*(6), 737–753. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999398379411>
- Cisler, J. M., & Koster, E. H. (2010). Mechanisms of attentional biases towards threat in anxiety disorders: An integrative review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *30*(2), 203–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.11.003>
- Clarke, P. J., MacLeod, C., & Guastella, A. J. (2013). Assessing the role of spatial engagement and disengagement of attention in anxiety-linked attentional bias: A critique of current paradigms and suggestions for future research directions. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *26*(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2011.638054>
- Cristea, I. A., Kok, R. N., & Cuijpers, P. (2015). Efficacy of cognitive bias modification interventions in anxiety and depression: Meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *206*(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.114.146761>
- Derryberry, D., & Reed, M. A. (2002). Anxiety-related attentional biases and their regulation by attentional control. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *111*(2), 225–236. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843x.111.2.225>
- Egloff, B., & Hock, M. (2001). Interactive effects of state anxiety and trait anxiety on emotional Stroop interference. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *31*, 875–882. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00188-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00188-4)
- Fox, E. (2002). Processing emotional facial expressions: The role of anxiety and awareness. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *2*(1), 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.3758/CABN.2.1.52>
- Gratton, G., Coles, M. G., & Donchin, E. (1983). A new method for off-line removal of ocular artifact. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, *55*(4), 468–484. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(83\)90135-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(83)90135-9)
- Gregoriou, G. G., Rossi, A. F., Ungerleider, L. G., & Desimone, R. (2014). Lesions of prefrontal cortex reduce attentional modulation of neuronal responses and synchrony in V4. *Nature Neuroscience*, *17*(7), 1003–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3742>
- Harrewijn, A., Schmidt, L. A., Westenberg, P. M., Tang, A., & van der Molen, M. J. (2017). Electrocardiac measures of information processing biases in social anxiety disorder: A review. *Biological Psychology*, *129*, 324–348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2017.09.013>

- Hermans, E. J., Henckens, M. J., Joels, M., & Fernandez, G. (2014). Dynamic adaptation of large-scale brain networks in response to acute stressors. *Trends in Neuroscience*, *37*(6), 304–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2014.03.006>
- Hou, R., Moss-Morris, R., Risdale, A., Lynch, J., Jeevaratnam, P., Bradley, B. P., & Mogg, K. (2014). Attention processes in chronic fatigue syndrome: Attentional bias for health-related threat and the role of attentional control. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *52*, 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2013.10.005>
- Judah, M. R., Grant, D. M., Mills, A. C., & Lechner, W. V. (2014). Factor structure and validation of the attentional control scale. *Cognition & Emotion*, *28*(3), 433–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2013.835254>
- Keune, P. M., Hansen, S., Weber, E., Zapf, F., Habich, J., Muenssinger, J., ... Oschmann, P. (2017). Exploring resting-state EEG brain oscillatory activity in relation to cognitive functioning in multiple sclerosis. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *128*(9), 1746–1754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2017.06.253>
- Knyazev, G. G. (2007). Motivation, emotion, and their inhibitory control mirrored in brain oscillations. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *31*(3), 377–395. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.10.004>
- Koster, E. H., Crombez, G., Verschuere, B., Vanvolsem, P., & De Houwer, J. (2007). A time-course analysis of attentional cueing by threatening scenes. *Experimental Psychology*, *54*(2), 161–171. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169.54.2.161>
- Koster, E. H., Verschuere, B., Crombez, G., & Van Damme, S. (2005). Time-course of attention for threatening pictures in high and low trait anxiety. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, *43*(8), 1087–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2004.08.004>
- Lang, P. J., Bradley, M. M., & Cuthbert, B. N. (1997). International Affective Picture System (IAPS): Technical Manual and Affective Ratings. *NIMH Center for the Study of Emotion and Attention*, 39–58.
- Mackintosh, B., & Mathews, A. (2003). Don't look now: Attentional avoidance of emotionally valenced cues. *Cognition & Emotion*, *17*(4), 623–646. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930302298>
- MacLeod, C., Mathews, A., & Tata, P. (1986). Attentional bias in emotional disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *95*(1), 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.95.1.15>
- Massar, S. A., Kenemans, J. L., & Schutter, D. J. (2014). Resting-state EEG theta activity and risk learning: Sensitivity to reward or punishment? *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *91*(3), 172–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2013.10.013>
- Mogg, K., & Bradley, B. P. (1998). A cognitive-motivational analysis of anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *36*(9), 809–848. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967\(98\)00063-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967(98)00063-1)
- Mogg, K., & Bradley, B. P. (2016). Anxiety and attention to threat: Cognitive mechanisms and treatment with attention bias modification. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *87*, 76–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2016.08.001>
- Mogg, K., Bradley, B., Miles, F., & Dixon, R. (2004). Time course of attentional bias for threat scenes: Testing the vigilance-avoidance hypothesis. *Cognition and Emotion*, *18*(5), 689–700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930341000158>
- Mogg, K., Philippot, P., & Bradley, B. P. (2004). Selective attention to angry faces in clinical social phobia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *113*(1), 160–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.113.1.160>
- Mogg, K., Weinman, J., & Mathews, A. (1987). Memory bias in clinical anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *96*(2), 94–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-843x.96.2.94>
- Ohman, A. (1993). Fear and anxiety as emotional phenomena: Clinical phenomenology, evolutionary perspectives, and information-processing mechanisms. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 511–536). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ohman, A. (1994). The psychophysiology of emotion: Evolutionary and nonconscious origins. In G. d'Ydewalle, P. Eelen, & P. Bertelsen (Eds.), *International perspectives on psychological science*, Vol. 1 (pp. 197–226). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Peers, P. V., & Lawrence, A. D. (2009). Attentional control of emotional distraction in rapid serial visual presentation. *Emotion*, *9*(1), 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014507>
- Pine, D. S., Mogg, K., Bradley, B. P., Montgomery, L., Monk, C. S., McClure, E., ... Kaufman, J. (2005). Attention bias to threat in maltreated children: Implications for vulnerability to stress-related psychopathology. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *162*(2), 291–296. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.162.2.291>
- Posner, M. I., & Cohen, Y. (1984). Components of visual orienting. *Attention and Performance X: Control of Language Processes*, *32*, 531–556.
- Putman, P., Arias-Garcia, E., Pantazi, I., & van Schie, C. (2012). Emotional Stroop interference for threatening words is related to reduced EEG delta-beta coupling and low attentional control. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *84*(2), 194–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2012.02.006>
- Putman, P., van Peer, J., Maimari, I., & van der Werff, S. (2010). EEG theta/beta ratio in relation to fear-modulated response-inhibition, attentional control, and affective traits. *Biological Psychology*, *83*(2), 73–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2009.10.008>
- Putman, P., Verkuil, B., Arias-Garcia, E., Pantazi, I., & van Schie, C. (2014). EEG theta/beta ratio as a potential biomarker for attentional control and resilience against deleterious effects of stress on attention. *Cognitive Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *14*(2), 782–791. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-013-0238-7>
- Reinholdt-Dunne, M. L., Mogg, K., & Bradley, B. P. (2009). Effects of anxiety and attention control on processing pictorial and linguistic emotional information. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *47*(5), 410–417. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2009.01.012>
- Sari, B. A., Koster, E. H., Pourtois, G., & Derakshan, N. (2016). Training working memory to improve attentional control in anxiety: A proof-of-principle study using behavioral and electrophysiological measures. *Biological Psychology*, *121*, 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2015.09.008>
- Schoorl, M., Putman, P., Van Der Werff, S., & Van Der Does, A. J. (2014). Attentional bias and attentional control in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *28*(2), 203–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2013.10.001>
- Schutte, I., Kenemans, J. L., & Schutter, D. (2017). Resting-state theta/beta EEG ratio is associated with reward- and punishment-related reversal learning. *Cognitive Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *17*(4), 754–763. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-017-0510-3>
- Schutter, D. J., & Knyazev, G. G. (2012). Cross-frequency coupling of brain oscillations in studying motivation and emotion. *Motivation and Emotion*, *36*(1), 46–54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-011-9237-6>
- Schutter, D. J. L. G., & Van Honk, J. (2005). Electrophysiological ratio markers for the balance between reward and punishment. *Cognitive Brain Research*, *24*(3), 685–690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.04.002>
- Shechner, T., & Bar-Haim, Y. (2016). Threat monitoring and attention-bias modification in anxiety and stress-related disorders. *Current*

- Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(6), 431–437. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416664341>
- Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI form Y)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Taylor, C. T., Cross, K., & Amir, N. (2016). Attentional control moderates the relationship between social anxiety symptoms and attentional disengagement from threatening information. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 50, 68–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2015.05.008>
- Van Bockstaele, B., Verschuere, B., Tibboel, H., De Houwer, J., Crombez, G., & Koster, E. H. (2014). A review of current evidence for the causal impact of attentional bias on fear and anxiety. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(3), 682–721. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034834>
- Van der Linden, D., Frese, M., & Meijman, T. F. (2003). Mental fatigue and the control of cognitive processes: Effects on perseveration and planning. *Acta Psychologica*, 113(1), 45–65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-6918\(02\)00150-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-6918(02)00150-6)
- Van der Ploeg, H. M., Defares, P. B., & Spielberger, C. D. (1980). *ZBV: Handleiding bij de zelf-beoordelings vragenlijst: Een Nederlandstalige bewerking van Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory STAI-Y* [ZBV: Handbook on self-report questionnaires: A Dutch translation of the Spielberger State-Trait Inventory STAI-0Y]. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Harcourt.
- Van Dongen, H. P., & Dinges, D. F. (2000). Circadian rhythms in fatigue, alertness, and performance. *Principles and Practice of Sleep Medicine*, 20, 391–399.
- Verwoerd, J., de Jong, P. J., & Wessel, I. (2006). *ACS: Dutch translation of the Attentional Control Scale, originally developed by Derryberry and Reed (2002)* (Unpublished manuscript). University of Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Wald, I., Shechner, T., Bitton, S., Holoshitz, Y., Charney, D. S., Muller, D., ... Bar-Haim, Y. (2011). Attention bias away from threat during life threatening danger predicts PTSD symptoms at one-year follow-up. *Depression and Anxiety*, 28(5), 406–411. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.20808>
- Whalen, P. J. (1998). Fear, vigilance, and ambiguity: Initial neuroimaging studies of the human amygdala. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 7(6), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10836912>

How to cite this article: van Son D, Angelidis A, Hagenars MA, van der Does W, Putman P. Early and late dot-probe attentional bias to mild and high threat pictures: Relations with EEG theta/beta ratio, self-reported trait attentional control, and trait anxiety. *Psychophysiology*. 2018;55:e13274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13274>